

RECEIVED

SEP 20 1999

FLIESLER DUBB,
MEYER & LOVEJOY



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

1.0

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/115,273	07/14/98	MASON	M FLAT1001MCF

MARTIN C FLIESLER
FLIESLER DUBB MEYER & LOVEJOY
FOUR EMBARCADERO CENTER SUITE 400
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111-4148

LM01/0915

EXAMINER

BROWN, D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2773

DATE MAILED:

09/15/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

PLAT 1000

Response

December 15, 1999

March 15, 2000

MCF/JWG

JUL

att

me

Office Action SummaryApplication No.
09/115,273Applicant(s)
Matthew J. MasonExaminer
David E. BrownGroup Art Unit
2773☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jul 14, 1998☐ This action is **FINAL**.☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims☒ Claim(s) 1-87 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.☒ Claim(s) 1-87 is/are rejected.☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.**Application Papers**☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
☐ received.☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).**Attachment(s)**☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2773

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-87 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant's limitation of a "Windows 95 Explorer style presentation" is indefinite in that Applicant failed to state which version of the Windows 95 Explorer is applicable and would further define the style.

It will be assumed by the examiner for purposes of this Office Action that Windows 95 Explorer "style" will mean a display with a left panel (tree) and right panel (content).

3. Claim 9 recites the limitation "selected objects" in the third line. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2773

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-16, 25-40, 49-64 and 73-80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen (5,819,042) in view of How to use Windows NT 4 Workstation (herein referred to as Windows).

Independent Claims 1, 25, 49, 73

Hansen discloses a configuration device (apparatus), Title, configured to perform configuration management functions (configuration of unconfigured network and Internet devices), id, on objects (devices) within the configuration management system, id; and a display device (GUI), Column 5 line 3, configured to display a representation of the objects, id. However, Hansen does not utilize a Windows 95 Explorer style.

Windows discloses a display devise in a Windows 95 Explorer style display, page 35 main figure.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to add an Explorer style display to Hansen because the Explorer style would provide a hierarchial or outline view of complex networks which would make internetworking administration easier to a novice user. See Hansen Column 1 line 62- Column 2 line 3.

Art Unit: 2773

Claims 2, 26, 50, and 74

See the discussion of claims 1, 25, 49, and 73 supra. Hanson discloses objects outside of the configuration management system are checked into the configuration management system (added to the network map) by dragging and dropping them into the representation displayed on the display device. Column 11 line 58 - Column 12 line 2.

Claims 3, 27, 51

See the discussion of claims 2, 26, and 50 supra. Hansen discloses an object that is a file (configuration files). Column 5 lines 9-15

Claims 4, 28, 52 and 75

See the discussion of claims 1, 25, 49 and 73 supra. However, Hansen does not specifically disclose an object that is checked out by dragging and dropping them from the representation to another system.

Windows discloses an object that is dragged out of the representation (source folder) to another system (folder), Page 41 Paragraph #2.

Claims 5, 7, 8, 29, 31, 32, 53, 55, 56, 76-78

See the discussion of claims 1, 25, 49 and 73 supra. Hanson discloses a display device (GUI) to provide access to the configuration management functions by allowing a user to invoke

Art Unit: 2773

(invocation by clicking on the left mouse button) at least one of the configuration management functions (checking in objects) Column 11 line 58 - Column 12 line 2.

Claims 6, 30, and 54

See the discussion of claims 5, 29, and 53 supra. However, Hansen does not specifically disclose a configuration management function (Delete) that is provided by right click menu.

Windows discloses a configuration management function ("Delete", which is equivalent to the remove item configuration management function) that is provided by the right click menu Page 40 #5.

Claims 9, 33 and 57

See the discussion of claims 5, 29, and 53 supra. However, Hansen does not specifically disclose an object that is checked out by dragging and dropping them from the representation to another system.

Windows discloses an object that is dragged out of the representation (source folder) to another system by the user invoking (left click) the function in order to perform a drag and drop. Page 41 Paragraph #2.

Claims 10, 34 and 58

See the discussion of claims 1, 25, and 49 supra. However, Hansen does not specifically disclose a properties device or a shortcut device.

Windows NT has a properties device (Properties) configured to display properties of a selected object, page 38 Tip Sheet 2nd paragraph; Windows discloses a shortcut device

Art Unit: 2773

("shortcut") to create shortcuts directly to specific contexts, pages 28-29; and the representation of the object includes an icon (folder icon), page 28 #1.

Claims 11, 13, 14, 35, 37, 38, 59, 61 and 62

See the discussion of claims 5, 29, and 53 supra. However, Hansen does not specifically disclose a tree view and a list view.

Windows discloses a tree view and a list view, page 28 #1, wherein the tree view has the objects within the configuration management system, id, and the list view displays contents and relationships of the selected object in the tree view, page 35 #2 and file date/time, page 39 #3 and page 38 Tip Sheet 2nd paragraph.

Claims 12, 36, and 60

See the discussion of claims 11, 35 and 59 supra. However, Hansen does not disclose a status view.

Windows discloses a status view that displays the status of functions executed by the configuration management system. Page 38 Tip Sheet 3rd paragraph.

Claims 15, 39, 63 and 79

See the discussion of claims 1, 25, 49 and 73 supra. Hansen discloses a configuration management system that comprises a network interface (modem), Figure 4 reference number 28 for connecting the server to the network. However Hansen/Windows does not discuss a server.

Art Unit: 2773

The background in Hansen discusses local area networks (LANs), Column 1 line 38 and wide area networks (WAN), Column 1 line 40.

Official Notice is taken that it is well-known in the art that servers are used to transmit information in both LANs and WANs. Therefore, the use of a server to execute the configuration controller would have been obvious to one skilled in the art.

In addition, Windows discusses the ability to facilitate networks. See Windows page 18-19.

Claims 16, 40, 64, and 80

See the discussion of claims 15, 39, 63 and 79 supra. However Hansen does not disclose a web interface.

Windows discloses a web interface (Internet Explorer) which is an interface to the Internet, page 117, or intranet, id 2nd paragraph.

Official Notice is taken that the transmitted information over the Internet network is in the form of an HTML document. See page 120, Tip Sheet.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claim 17-24, 41-48, 65-72, 81-87 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims and 112 2nd rejections are corrected..

Art Unit: 2773

7. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Claims 17-19, 41-43, 65-67, 81

See the discussions of claims 16, 40, 64 and 80 supra. The prior art of record does not specifically disclose or suggest the transmitted information including one of an Active X component, Visual Java program, Java applet and PERL program configured to utilize the information produced by the configuration controller. Therefore, if the 112 rejection is satisfied and the these claims are rewritten in independent form they would be allowable over the prior art of record.

Claims 20-24, 44-48, 68-72, 82, 83

See the discussion of claims 1, 15, 25, 39, 49, and 63 supra. The prior art of record does not disclose or suggest a report generator. Therefore, if the 112 rejection is satisfied and the these claims are rewritten in independent form they would be allowable over the prior art of record.

Claims 84-87

See the discussion of claims 1, 25 and 49 supra. The prior art of record does not disclose or suggest a registration device. Therefore, if the 112 rejection is satisfied and the these claims are rewritten in independent form they would be allowable over the prior art of record.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Van De Vanter (5,805,889) and Curtis et al. (5,774,689) disclose configuration management systems.

Application/Control Number: 09/115,273

Page 9

Art Unit: 2773


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David E. Brown whose telephone number is (703) 305-4249. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Kim, can be reached on (703) 305-3821. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-5355.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

DB

9/9/99


RAYMOND J. BAYERL
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2773